DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 639 95 SP 011 407

AUTHOR Howes, Nancy
TITLE Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs. Vol. 5, Leadership Process.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 77p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and SP011 542 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This report examines consortia leadership factors in institutions of higher education (IHE) responding to a New York State Department of Education mandate for performance based teacher education (PBTE). To assess the effect of leadership on program registration, the following questions were investigated: (1) the nature of leadership within and across the task force, policy board, and IHE in terms of leaders' commitment to PBTE, to the design of a PBTE program, to provisions for logistical and psychological support, and to frequency of meeting with his group or individual members; (2) the similarities and dissimilarities in leadership styles, viewed across the varied categories of IHE size and type, program registration respondent group, and program type; (3) the relationship, if any, between the various elements of leadership; and (4) the set of leadership variables most strongly related to program design being accepted for a four year rather than a one-year period. Analysis of the data is presented, and the conclusion is drawn that leaders generally took an active role in the work of their groups, contributed both logistical and psychological support, and that good leadership contributed significantly to design efforts that resulted in a four-year program registration. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143639

Factors Affecting The Institutional Development of

CBTE Programs / vol. 5

Leadership Process

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Nancy J. Howes

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

SP011 407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED143639

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of eight written as a result of that acceptance. Details are given in the Introduction that follows.

SP 011 407

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction to the TEDS Research Project	1
History of CBTE in New York State	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose	5
Focus	5
Population	6
Sample	6
Data Collection	8
Summary	8
II. Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs	
Introduction	1
Research Questions	8
Summary and Conclusions	29
Appendix A	
Glossary of Terms	
Appendix B	
Responding Institutions	
Number of Responses by Category	
Responses per Institution by Role	
Appendix C	
Questionnaire	
Appendix D	
Perception of the Institution of Higher Education's Leadership	
Appendix E	
ANOVA Tables for Leadership Variables	
Appendix F	
Factor Analysis of Leadership Variables	

This document consists of material prepared under Contract No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps.

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgements are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc. was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke, we would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

Introduction to the TEDS Research Project

In August 1975 the Teacher Education Developmental Service began a study designed to document the process of program development in teacher training institutions in New York State responding to a statewide mandate for Competence Based Teacher Education. This comprehensive study was completed in July 1976. The efforts of six professors and five research associates from various disciplines in the School of Education were combined to carry out the study. Six reports resulted from the study.

1. "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."
2. "Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
3. "Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
4. "Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs.
5. "Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
6. "Technical Assistance Factors Affecting Institutional." Development of CBTE Programs.

HISTORY OF CBTE IN NEW YORK STATE

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the State to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

Recently the 1972 New York Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School; the Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education". That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The Regents intended this goal to be implemented in Competency Based Teacher Education programs, with the state maintaining ultimate control through its program registration system.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned and supported by the New York State Department of Education. The projects included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influentical and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode. Other models, including the various Teacher Corps programs, were being developed and tested during the same period.

To implement the goal of state-wide competency based teacher education, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

The first round of program submissions was completed in February, 1975. This research report concerns those institutions involved in meeting the February, 1975 deadline.

Statement of the Problem:

What are the processess involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responed to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

The February, 1975 deadline for programs in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandate change toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs for program registration to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics represented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomona; 1) the variations in institutional setting and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses eminates.

This study concerns itself with the first part of the problem: the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying institutional settings and differing organizational, social, and physical characteristics.

Population

The population for this study consisted of those institutions which were required to submit CBTE program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. Sixty institutions fell into this category encompassing one hundred forty-six teacher training programs. These programs proposed to train elementary school teachers in the following areas:

1. N-6 (81)
2. Speech Hearing (25)
3. 7-9 (6)
4. Deaf (3)
5. Blind (1)
6. SpecialEducation (30)

146

Sample

The researchers assumed that factors of institutional size and whether or not institutions were publicly or privately funded could provide a basis for comparison. Also, two categories were formed on the basis of whether or not institutions received one year or four year registration from the SED. Comparisons are made on the basis of these categories of analysis in each report. The categories formed on the basis of these criteria (size, funding, and registration) follow:

One year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

Four year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
Small	4

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to: 1) identify, 2) describe, and 3) compare the characteristics (elements or factors) of the process of designing CBTE program proposals in various institutions in New York State as they responded to a state-wide mandate for CBTE.

Focus

The study focused upon those institutions which:

1) were to submit teacher training program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. These include programs for the preparation of teachers in the following subject areas:

   a. N-6
   b. Special Education
   c. 7-9
   d. Speech-Hearing
   e. Deaf
   f. Blind

2) received one-year and/or four-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Dept., division of Teacher Education and certification,

3) met the creteria set by the researchers regarding institutions, and whether or not they were public or private institutions containing appropriate programs, and,

4) indicated a willingness to participate in the study by allowing administration of questionnaires. It should be noted that the state mandate places Responsibility for program design upon the institutions of higher education. However, the mandate also requires that the institutions design the programs by collaborating with school district personnel and personnel from appropriate professional agencies. This collabortive group is known as the consortium and becomes the focal point for data collection in the study. The consortium also included sub groupings termed the Policy Board and Task Force whose behavior and involvement in the process will be analyzed.

There was an insufficient number of small institutions to categorize them into private or public categories. One category had only four institutions and therefore the decision was made to place four institutions in each category to insure a balanced response from all categories. Initially, institutions to be placed in the remaining categories were chosen to insure the widest possible geographical dispersion throughout the state. Some institutions declined participation in the study. Back-up institutions were also selected on the basis of geographical dispersion and availabliilty.

An additional categroy of institutions was constructed from institutions which submitted two programs which received differing program registration (1 year or 4 year). This was done to provide a comparison of one and four year program development within institutions. This categroy was divided into public and private institutions.

One and four year registration

Public	(4)
Private	(4)

As a result of these categories and the necessity to place four institutions in each category thirty two institutions comprised the sample.

Eighteen of the 32 institutions responded.

Eight individuals at each institutions were identified according to role. These roles were identified in order to allow for a representative sample of all groups involved in the development of the CBTE program. The individuals identified were as follows:

--School of Education Dean or Department Chairman
--Public School Principal on the Policy Board
--Public School Teacher on the Policy Board
--College Faculty Member on the Policy Board
--Task Force Chairman
--Task Force Member from public school
--Task Force Member from college faculty
--Chairman of Policy Board

Each individual described above was given one questionnaire specifically disigned for his role. (For further information see Appendix B)

Data Collection

Due to the complex nature of the data the difficulties in the logistics of data collection, the decision was made to collect data through a questionnaire. Whenever possible (twenty seven of the thirty two institutions) the questionnaire was administered by one of the researchers at a meeting of the individuals filling out the questionnaire. The data gathered was either brought back by the researcher or mailed in by the respondents. Thus, the majority of the data was collected through on-site visitations.

Summary

The information presented in this section of the report is provided to introduce and explain the context and conduct of the comprehensive study. More specific information regarding the entire study is available in Report #1, "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."

II Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs

Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs

INTRODUCTION

In most organizations, good leaders facilitate the development of a new program. In fact, leaders of a design effort can be viewed as agents of change; and, as such, they may be crucial to the entire process. As change agents, leaders are often the doers, the innovators, the supporters and the catalysts of change programs. In these positions, they are involved with communication processes, group dynamics, information retrieval, action research, evaluation of programs, outside support groups (i.e., community organizations), and direction and support of co-workers.[1]

Did leaders play a crucial role in the development of CBTE programs? Were the task force and policy board chairpersons and the dean or Education chairperson of the institution of higher education (hereafter referred to as IHE) important to the design of CBTE programs?

To obtain answers to these questions, the following research questions were developed:

[1] Leslie Chamberlain, "Educational Change: Where Does One Start?" Clearing House, Volume 47, Number 5 (January 1973), p. 265.

1. What is the nature of leadership within and across the task force, policy board, and IHE in terms of the:

    a. Leader's commitment to CBTE;
    b. Leader's commitment to the design of a CBTE plan;
    c. Leader's provision of logistical support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan;
    d. Leader's provision of psychological support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan; and
    e. Leader's frequency of meetings with the group or its individual members?

2. What are the areas of similarity or dissimilarity in the leadership of the task force, policy board and IHE as viewed across the varied categories of IHE size and type, program registration, respondent group, and program type?

3. What is the relationship, if any, between the various elements of leadership?

4. What is the set of leadership variables which most strongly relates to a CBTE program design being accepted for a four rather than a one year period?

To gather data about the leadership characteristics of the consortia and their sub-units, twenty-four questions about the perceived leadership of either the task force, policy board, or IHE were presented to the study's respondents. For twenty-two questions, the respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed (on a five point Likert scale where 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) to the leadership statements. For two questions, the respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which the group's leadership met with the group or its members. A different questionnaire was given to members of the task force, policy board and IHE. These questionnaires are presented in Appendix C.

To analyze data about the leadership questions, four major analyses were performed. To describe the nature of the leadership within and across groups, the frequency and corresponding percents of response choices and group means were computed for each of the twenty four statements. To describe the degree of similarity/dissimilarity of the perceptions across the varied demographic groupings, a one way analysis of variance was performed on the different group means. To identify what relationship existed between the leadership variables, a factor analysis with varimax rotation (principle components analysis) was performed. And, to identify the set of variables which most strongly related to four year program registration, a multiple regression analysis was performed.

Since the demographic data on the leadership respondents is pertinent to analyzing the data, this information will be presented first in the next section. Then, in the following sections, the basic research questions will be addressed in turn. In the final section, the overall characteristics of CBTE program design leadership will be summarized and analyzed.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON THE RESPONDENTS

Table 1 presents demographic data on the leadership respondents. The number of respondents by CBTE design role by type of program registration, by type of IHE, by size of IHE, by type of program, and by group membership will be reported.

Leadership Respondents: Demographic Data

TABLE I

A. Number of Respondents by CBTE Design Roles

ROLES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Dean	1	1.6
Principal - Policy Board	11	18.0
Teacher - Policy Board	6	9.8
College Faculty - Policy Board	9	14.8
Task Force Chairperson	9	14.8
Public School Staff - Task Force	10	16.4
College - Task	8	13.1
Policy Board Chairperson	7	11.5
TOTALS	61	100.0

B. Number of Respondents by Type of Program Registration

PROGRAM REGISTRATION	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
One Year	27	44.3
Four Year	34	55.7
TOTALS	61	100.0

C. Number of Respondents by Type of IHE*

IHE TYPE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Public	11	18.0
Private	50	82.0
TOTALS	61	100.0

D. Number of Respondents by Size of IHE

IHE*SIZE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Large	43	70.5
Small	18	29.5
TOTALS	61	100.0

E. Number of Respondents by Type of Program

PROGRAM TYPE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Elementary	53	86.9
Speech	2	3.3
Special	1	1.6
Other - Secondary	5	8.2
TOTALS	61	100.0

F. Number of Respondents by Group Membership

GROUP MEMBERSHIP	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Task Force	18	29.5
IHE *	16	26.2
Policy Board	27	44.3
TOTALS	61	100.0

*IHE = Institution of Higher Education

Altogether, 61 respondents from 18 institutions supplied useable data for this report. With the exception of the deanship, for which there was only one respondent, the respondent design roles were fairly evenly distributed. Section A of Table 1 provides a more complete description of this information.

The number of respondents by type of program registration was also fairly evenly distributed. (See Section B of Table 1) Twenty-seven respondents (44%) were members of a consortium which received one year registration and 34 respondents (56%) were members of a consortium which received four year registration.

The number of respondents by type of IHE was not evenly distributed, although it reflected the statistical ratio of private to public colleges/universities in New York State. (See Section C of Table 1) In this, eleven (18%) of the respondents worked with public IHEs and 50 (82%) of the respondents worked with private IHEs.

The number of respondents by size of IHE also reflected the ratio of large to small schools of education in New York State. (See Section D of Table 1) Here, 43 (70.5%) of the respondents worked with large IHEs (100 or more students in the school of education) and 18 (29.5%) of the respondents worked with small IHEs (less than 100 students in the school of education).

The number of respondents by type of program reflected the current demands of the teacher market and the order in which the State Education Department requested the programs to be developed. (See Section E of Table 1) Here 53 (87%) of the respondents worked in consortia which designed an elementary program, two (3%) worked in consortia which designed a speech program, one (2%) worked in a consortium which designed a special education program, and six (8%) worked in consortia which designed other (e.g. secondary) programs.

The number of respondents by group membership (See Section F of Table 1), represented the number responding to each leadership questionnaire. In this, 18 individuals (29.5%) responded to the task force questionnaire, 16 (26%) to the IHE questionnaire, and 27 (44%) to the policy board questionnaire.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

What is the nature of leadership within and across the task force, policy board and IHE in terms of the:

a. Leader's commitment to CBTE;
b. Leader's commitment to the design of a CBTE plan;
c. Leader's provision of logistical support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan;
d. Leader's provision of psychological support for individuals working on the design of a CBTE plan; and,
e. Leader's frequency of meetings with the group or its individual members?

To address this question, the frequency of response choices, the corresponding percents and the mean responses for each statement were computed within and across each respondent group. The statements were categorized according to those items which comprised each of the five elements in the leadership question. Each one of these elements will be discussed in detail in the following pages.

Appendix D presents the individual and total group frequency and percent response choice breakdowns for each of the twenty-four items and Table 2 presents the individual group and total mean responses for each of the items.

Leader's Commitment to CBTE

The data to describe this leadership element was obtained by viewing each group's, and the total group's, mean responses

to four items: 1, 9, 12, and 14 (see Table 2). The frequency/percent distribution of the responses to these items (see Appendix D) were used only to supplement this leadership information.

The four items describing the leader's commitment to CBTE related to the leader's perceived:

a. approval of CBTE

b. commitment to CBTE

c. indifference to CBTE

d. resistance to CBTE

Across all three groups, respondents were generally similar in the way they viewed their leader's commitment to CBTE. Seventy-five percent of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed (mean response = 1.951) that their group leaders approved of CBTE. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed (mean response = 2.000) that their group leaders seemed committed to CBTE. Conversely, 80 percent of the respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed (mean response = 4.344) that their leaders were indifferent to CBTE. And, 88 percent strongly disagreed or disagreed (mean response = 4.459) that their leaders were resistant to CBTE.

The specific respondent groups tended to have a similar view about their leader's commitment to CBTE. There was, however, a slight tendency (see Table 2) for the policy board respondents

TABLE 2

Mean Perceptions of Leadership Characteristics by Individual and Total Groups

LEADERSHIP CATEGORY	MEAN GROUP PERCEPTION			TOTAL GROUP
	DIR.	TASK FORCE	POLICY BOARD	
1. Our group's leadership approves of CBTE.	2.125*	1.944	1.852	1.951*
2. Our group's leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	1.812*	1.667	1.593	1.672
3. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with me.	2.375*	2.056*	2.148*	2.180*
4. I received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	2.250*	1.833	2.111*	2.066*
5. Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	1.812	1.500	2.075*	1.836
6. Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE.	2.375*	1.667	1.852	1.934*
7. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	2.375*	2.111	1.889	2.082*
8. Our group's leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	2.500*	2.000	2.074	2.164*
9. Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.	2.312*	1.944	1.852*	2.000*
10. Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information.	2.375*	1.889	2.000	2.066*
11. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	2.750*	2.111	1.963	2.213*
12. Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	4.000*	4.222*	4.630	4.344*
13. Our group received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to it CBTE design performance.	2.375*	1.944	1.926*	2.049*
14. Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	4.250*	4.444	4.593	4.459
15. Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.	2.000*	1.722	1.556	1.721
16. Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	2.312*	1.611	1.481	1.738*
17. Our group's leadership provided our group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	2.562*	2.056	1.926	2.131*
18. Our group's leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	4.000*	4.444	4.667	4.426*
19. Our group's leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	4.125*	4.444	4.815	4.525
20. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	2.312*	2.000	1.963*	2.066*
21. Our group's leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	2.562*	1.889	1.889	2.066*

22.	Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort.	2.000*	1.667	1.741	1.787
23.	Our group's leadership met with our group: a. once a week b. once every two weeks, c. once a month d. several times a year, e. never	3.500*	3.222*	2.407*	2.934*
24.	Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process about: a. once a week, b. once every two weeks, c. once a month, d. several times a year, e. never.	3.500*	3.222*	2.444*	2.951*
	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	16	18	27	61

* Item whose standard deviation from mean is greater than 1.000.

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

The group's leadership related to task group, policy board, or IHE. The dean was leader of IHE; others were elicited from the task or policy board group.

and task force respondents to view their leadership more favorably than the IHE respondents who tended to be more varied in their choice of responses on the Likert scale. Although, the standard deviation of the IHE mean scores was larger than those of the task force or policy board, none of the group means were statistically different from each other.

Leader's Commitment to the Design of a CBTE Plan

The data to describe this leadership element was obtained by viewing each group's and the total group's mean responses to three items: 16, 18 and 19 (see Table 2 and Appendix D). These three items related to the leader's perceived:

a. commitment to the design of a CBTE plan
b. indifference to the design of a CBTE plan
c. resistance to the design of a CBTE plan

Across all the groups, respondents (again) were fairly consistent in the way they viewed their leader's commitment to the design of a CBTE plan. Eighty-four percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed (mean response = 1.738) that their group leader was committed to designing a CBTE plan. Eighty-seven percent strongly disagreed or disagreed ($\bar{x}$ = 4.426) that their group leader was indifferent to designing a CBTE plan. And, 89 percent strongly disagreed or disagreed ($\bar{x}$ = 4.525) that their leaders were resistant to designing a CBTE plan.

Again, the specific respondent groups tended to have a

similar view about their leader's lack of indifference and resistance to designing CBTE plans. However, for one item (leader's commitment to designing a CBTE plan), there was a statistically significant difference at the p = .03 level between the IHE, task force and policy board's respondents view of their group's leadership. For this item, the policy board ($\bar{x}$ = 1.481) and task force ($\bar{x}$ = 1.611) respondents more strongly agreed to the statement that their leader's had design commitment than did the IHE respondents ($\bar{x}$ = 2.312). In fact, only 62.5 percent of the IHE respondents strongly agreed or agreed to the statement, while 89 percent of the policy board and 94 percent of the task force respondents did so. Again, the standard deviations around the means were larger for this group than any other.

Leader's Logistical Support

Data from nine items (4,6,7,8,10,13,17,20, and 21) were used to describe the leader's formal logistical support (see Table 2 and Appendix D). These items related to the leader's perceived provision of:

a. adequate feedback to individuals on their design performance
b. necessary information on CBTE
c. sufficient assistance to the group
d. necessary assistance to individual group members
e. necessary CBTE design information
f. adequate feedback to the group on its design performance

g. necessary assistance to the group

h. sufficient assistance to the Task Group

i. adequate CBTE design information

Across all nine items, respondents were fairly consistent in the way they viewed their leader's logistical support. Seventy-two percent of all the respondents strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.066) that their leaders provided adequate feedback to group members and 70 percent strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.049) that their leaders provided adequate feedback to their group. Seventy-seven percent strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 1.934) that their leaders provided necessary information on CBTE; 75 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 2.066) agreed that their leaders provided necessary CBTE design information; and, 75 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 2.066) agreed that their leaders provided adequate CBTE design information. In addition, 74 percent strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.082) that their leader provided sufficient assistance to their group and 70 percent strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.131) that their leaders provided necessary assistance to their group. Also, 67 percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.164) that their leader provided necessary assistance to each group member and 75 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 2.066) that their leader provided necessary assistance to the task group itself.

When the individual group perspectives were viewed separately, differences were seen in the percent of respondents in each group

who agreed that their leaders provided sufficient or necessary feedback, assistance, or information. Again, fewer of the IHE respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their leadership (usually the dean or education chairperson) gave sufficient or necessary feedback, assistance or information. In fact, across all nine items between 72 and 89 percent of the task force respondents and 67 and 81 percent of the policy board respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their leaders provided necessary or sufficient logistical support, while only between 50 and 69 percent of the IHE respondents did so. Again, the IHE respondents were more strongly dispersed in their perceptions (as shown through a larger standard deviation score around the mean) than any other single group.

Leader's Psychological Support

Data from six items (2,3,5,11,15 and 22) were used to describe the leader's informal psychological support (see Table 2 and Appendix D). These items related to the leader's perceived:

a. concern for other's views on CBTE

b. concern in spending adequate time with individual group members

c. support for other's CBTE design efforts

d. concern in spending adequate time with the Task Group

e. support for the group's CBTE design effort

f. support for the Task Group's CBTE design effort

Across all six items, respondents were fairly consistent in the way they viewed their leader's psychological support. Eighty-nine percent of all the respondent's strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 1.672) that their leaders were concerned about their views on CBTE. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.180) that their leaders spent adequate time with them and 66 percent strongly agreed or agreed ($\bar{x}$ = 2.123) that their leaders spent adequate time with the Task Group. Finally, 74 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 1.836) strongly agreed or agreed that their leaders supported other's design efforts, 85 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 1.721) agreed that their leaders supported their group's design efforts, and 83 percent ($\bar{x}$ = 1.787) agreed that their leaders supported the Task Group's design effort.

When the individual group perspectives were viewed separately, differences were again seen in the percent of respondents in each group who agreed that their leaders provided necessary or adequate psychological support. As before, fewer of the IHE respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their leadership gave sufficient psychological support for the design effort. Across all six items, for example, between 67 and 100 percent of the task force and 67 and 96 percent of the policy board respondents strongly agreed that their leaders provided psychological support, while only between 50 and 75 percent of the IHE respondents did so. As before, the IHE respondents were more strongly dispersed in their perceptions (larger standard deviation from the mean) than any other group.

Leader's Frequency of Meetings With Others

Data from two items (23 and 24) were used to describe the amount of time the leaders spent meeting with others about the design effort. For these items, the respondents were asked to indicate from a multiple choice framework the amount of time the leader met with them or the Task Group.

Unlike the other items, the percent of respondents selecting any one answer was not consistent. In fact, most of the respondents (about 26 to 31 percent for each situation), believed that their leaders met with them or their Task Group nearly all the time, most of the time, or a little of the time.

This discrepancy in the respondents answers was even more apparent when individual groups' responses were viewed separately. In fact the differences were statistically significant at the .05 level or higher. In this, more of the policy board respondents believed that their leaders met with them or the Task Group than either the Task Force or IHE respondents. For example, in terms of meeting with the Task Group, 52 percent of the policy board respondents believed that their leaders met with that group nearly all the time, while only 11 percent of the task force and 13 percent of the IHE respondents did so. Likewise, in terms of meeting with other design groups, 44 percent of the policy board respondents believed that their leaders met with others nearly all the time, while only 11 percent of the task force and 13 percent of the IHE respondents did so. In fact in both cases, between 38 and 45 percent of the

task force respondents and 50 and 55 percent of the IHE respondents believed that their leaders met with them or the Task Group only a little or none of the time. In contrast, only 32 percent of the policy respondents believed that this was so.

Summary on the Nature of Leadership

Respondents involved in the CBTE plan development process believed their leaders (generally): (1) were committed to CBTE; (2) were committed to designing a CBTE plan for the consortium; (3) provided formal logistical support for the group and their members; and, (4) provided informal psychological support for the groups and their members. They were divided, though, on the amount of time they perceived their leaders as spending with them or the Task Force. In this, their responses ranged from perceiving the leaders as spending no or little time to most or all the time.

Although most of the groups were fairly consistent with each other in their perceptions of their group's leadership, the IHE respondents were usually less positive about their leaders' (deans or department chairpersons) commitment and support for the CBTE effort than were either the task force or policy board respondents. In fact, these respondents were usually evenly divided in agreeing or disagreeing to the statements about their leaders.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

What are the areas of similarity or dissimilarity in the leadership of the task force, policy board, and IHE as viewed across the varied categories of IHE size and type, program registration, program type and respondent groups?

To address this question, item means were computed for each category group and a one way analysis of variance was run on the group means. Where differences in the item means were computed to exist at the $p = .05$ level of significance or higher, these items were treated as reflective areas of dissimilarity and discussed in the following section. Where differences in the item means were not statistically significant at the .05 level, they were treated as reflective areas of similarity and discussed in Research Question 1.

Table 3 identifies those items whose mean differences across the groups were statistically significant at the $p = .05$ level or higher. Appendix E provides the ANOVA Table data for each of these items.

IHE Size

For IHR size, each of the institutions was placed into a large or small category depending on the number of its education students. Altogether, 18 of the respondents (29.5%) worked with small institutions and 43 (70.5%) worked with large institutions.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance of the Leadership Variables
By Program Success, IHE Type, IHE Size, Program, and Respondent Group

LEADERSHIP CATEGORY	GROUPING CATEGORY				
	Program Success	IHE Type	IHE Size	Program	Respondents Group
1. Our group's leadership approves of CBTE.	.249	.143	.012*	.151	.718
2. Our group's leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	.704	.498	.260	.854	.675
3. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with me.	.526	.761	.907	.709	.712
4. I received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	.531	.505	.294	.987	.540
5. Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	.515	.769	.006*	.861	.127
6. Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE.	.911	.260	.333	.541	.145
7. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.912	.318	.508	.546	.323
8. Our group's leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.681	.686	.402	.441	.266
9. Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.	.646	.030*	.009*	.204	.407
10. Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information.	.133	.458	.913	.476	.336
11. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	.682	.078	.325	.599	.059
12. Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	.158	.012*	.197	.457	.134
13. Our group received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to it CBTE design performance.	.899	.051*	.080	.983	.406
14. Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	.216	.158	.045*	.329	.538
15. Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.	.648	.041*	.017*	.874	.247
16. Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	.085	.922	.254	.753	.032*
17. Our group's leadership provided our group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	.708	.399	.217	.941	.114
18. Our group's leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	.410	.610	.392	.857	.141
19. Our group's leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	.067	.784	.056	.885	.071

20. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.414	.277	.142	.543	.523
21. Our group's leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	.493	.681	.558	.476	.070
22. Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort.	.899	.183	.080	.612	.488
23. Our group's leadership met with our group: a. once a week b. once every two weeks, c. once a month d. several times a year, e. never	.190	.393	.589	.440	.028*
24. Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process abour: a. once a week, b. once every two weeks, c. once a month, d. several times a year, e. never.	.093	.707	.930	.314	.024*

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 61

*See Appendix E for ANOVA Table Breakdowns; p $\leq$ .054

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

The group's leadership related to task group, policy board, or IHE. The dean was leader of IHE; others were elicited from the task or policy board group.

When the means were analyzed across these categories, statistically significant differences were computed for five (1,5,9,14 and 15) of the 24 items. Differences were seen to exist in the degree of the leader's:

a. approval of CBTE

b. support for other's CBTE design effort

c. commitment to CBTE

d. resistance to CBTE

e. support for the group's CBTE design effort

Two of these items related to the leader's perceived commitment to CBTE and three related to the leader's perceived psychological support of others.

Across all five items, respondents from small institutions more strongly agreed than respondents from larger IHEs that their leaders were committed to CBTE and psychologically supportive of others for their design efforts. In this, the mean for each item in the small institutions ranged from .167 to 1.444, while the means in the large institutions ranged from .607 to 2.233.

IHE Type

For IHE type, each of the institutions was defined as either a private or public institution. In this, eleven respondents (18%) worked with public IHEs and 50 (82%) worked with private IHEs.

For this category, statistically significant differences were found to exist for four items (9,12,13 and 15). Differences were seen in the degree of the leader's:

a. commitment to CBTE

b. indifference to CBTE

c. adequate feedback to the group on its design performance

d. support for the group's CBTE design effort

Two of these items related to the leader's perceived commitment to CBTE and two related to the leader's perceived psychological/ logistical support of others.

For all four items, respondents from private IHEs more strongly agreed than respondents from public IHE that their leaders were committed to CBTE and provided various levels of logistical or psychological support. As before, the mean for each item in the private IHEs ranged from .500 to 1.920, while the means in the public IHEs ranged from 1.373 to 2.636.

Program Registration

For program registration, each of the institutions received either a one year or four year registration. These two types of registrations were used for the category groupings. Twenty-seven respondents (44%) were members of a consortium receiving one year registration and 31 (56%) were members of one receiving four year registration for their programs.

Despite what was expected, no statistical differences at the p = .05 level or higher were found for this grouping.

Program Type

Programs in each of the institutions ranged from elementary, speech, special and secondary. Since, 53 (87%) of the respondents worked in consortia which designed an elementary program and only 8 (13%) worked in consortia which designed other programs, there was not enough data across the categories to perform this analysis.

Respondent Groups

Sixty-one respondents filled out leadership questionnaires. Eighteen (29.5%) were members of the task force, 16 (26%) were members of the IHE, and 27 (44%) were members of the policy board groups.

Statistically significant differences were found to exist for three items (16,23 and 24). Differences were seen in the leader's:

a. commitment to designing a CBTE program
b. spending of time with the task group
c. spending of time with others

In all three items (see discussion of Research Question 1), more members of the policy board and task force agreed than members of the IHE that their leaders were committed to designing

a CBTE program and spending more time with the task group or others. In this, the item means for the task force ranged from 1.611 to 3.222 and the means for the policy board ranged from 1.482 to 2.444 while the means for the IHE ranged from 2.313 to 3.500.

Summary of the Differences in Leadership Characteristics

For most groups, few statistically significant differences at the .05 level or higher were seen to exist. Despite what was expected, no differences in group means were found across the two program registration categories. As had been expected, however, differences were seen in the IHE size and type and respondent group. To varying degrees, leaders in small and private IHEs were seen as: (1) more committed to CBTE; (2) more committed to the design of CBTE programs; and, (3) more psychologically/logistically supportive of others' design efforts than leaders in large and public IHEs. Also, leaders of the task force and policy board groups were seen as more committed to the design effort and more concerned with spending time with others than were leaders viewed within IHEs.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

What is the relationship, if any, between the various elements of leadership?

To address this question, a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation was run on all the leadership variables. Table 4 and Appendix F present the results of this analysis. Table 4 identifies those items which correlated with others to a degree greater than $\pm$.529. Appendix F presents the correlation coefficients for all of the items.

As had been expected, the a priori factor groupings of the leadership variables (e.g. leader's commitment to CBTE, commitment to CBTE design effort, psychological support for others, logistical support for others, and amount of time spent meeting with others) were largely maintained. Essentially, four basic factors (see Table 4) were identified. These factors related to four of the five a priori groupings. The two major factors were: (1) leader's logistical support (Factor 1); and (2) leader's commitment to CBTE in CBTE design efforts (Factor 2). Factor 2 was composed of two of the a priori groupings. The secondary factors were: (3) leader's psychological support, and (4) amount of time leaders spent meeting with others.

TABLE 4

Factor Analysis of Leadership Variables -- Varimax Rotation

VARIABLE CATEGORY	Factor Membership, R .60000				
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1. Our group's leadership approves of CBTE.		.77200			
2. Our group's leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.			.63026		
3. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with me.	.52882*				
4. I received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	.56641*				
5. Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.					.78720
6. Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE.	.76806				
7. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.77048				
8. Our group's leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.80665				
9. Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.		.76533			
10. Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information.	.82916				
11. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	.74843				
12. Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	.58079*				
13. Our group received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to it CBTE design performance.	.71675				
14. Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.		.84030			
15. Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.			.79292		
16. Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.		.71580			
17. Our group's leadership provided our group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	.87210				
18. Our group's leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	.63004				
19. Our group's leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.		.85358			
20. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.87583				

21.	Our group's leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	.85108				
22.	Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort.			.65191		
23.	Our group's leadership met with our group: a. once a week b. once every two weeks, c. once a month d. several times a year, e. never.				.85895	
24.	Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process abour: a. once a week, b. once every two weeks, c. once a month, d. several times a year, e. never.				.79078	

TOTAL RESPONDENTS = 61

*variables less strongly related but still part of factors

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

The group's leadership related to task group, policy board, or IHE. The dean was leader of IHE; others were elicited from the task or policy board group.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

What is the set of leadership variables which most strongly relates to a CBTE program design being accepted for a four rather than a one year period?

To address this question, a multiple regression analysis was run on all the leadership variables. Table 5 presents the result of this analysis -- a multiple regression equation of 8 of the 24 variables which most strongly related to a program receiving a four rather than a one year registration.

In this equation, variables from all of the a priori and factored factors are represented. Together, these eight variables in combination predicted 32 percent of the variance associated with obtaining a four rather than a one year registration (R^2 = .3242). Those variables in order of their contribution to the predicted variance are: (1) the leader meeting most every meeting with the group members (R = .2916); (2) leaders being committed to designing a CBTE program (R = .3422); (3) leaders giving sufficient assistance to the work groups (R = .4174); (4) leaders providing CBTE design information (R = .5123); (5) leaders <u>not</u> being indifferent to CBTE (R = .5272); (6) leaders being committed to CBTE (R = .5395); (7) leaders adequately supporting the group's design efforts (R = .5559) and, (8) leaders providing information about CBTE (R = .5694).

TABLE 5

Stepwise Multiple Regression of The Leadership Variables as Predictors of Program Registration of Four Years

	Cumulative Indicators			
	Step No.	Correlation (R)	Predicted Variance (R^2)	Increase in Variance (R^2)
1. Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process once a week (every meeting)	1	.2916	.0850	.0850
2. Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program	2	.3422	.1171	.0321
3. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to one group	3	.4174	.1743	.0572
4. Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information	4	.5123	.2624	.0881
5. Our group's leadership does not seem indifferent to CBTE*	5	.5272	.2780	.0156
6. Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE	6	.5395	.2911	.0131
7. Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort	7	.5559	.3091	.0180
8. Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE	8	.5694	.3242	.0151

* Variable reversed, so all variables in positive direction.

The largest predictors of four year registration were leaders meeting most every meeting with group members and leaders providing CBTE design information. Each accounted for over 8 percent of the predicted variance. The third largest predictor, leaders giving sufficient assistance to the work groups provided over 6 percent of the predicted variance. The other leadership variables provided between one to three percent of the predicted variance.

LEADERSHIP SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

What was the CBTE design role assumed by the leaders of the task force, policy board and IHE? Did they assume doer, innovator, supporter or catalyst roles? Were they involved with group dynamics, information retrieval, communication processes and direction and support of co-workers?

The answer to the last two questions must be yes. Most of the task force, policy board and IHE respondents perceived their leaders to be committed to CBTE and the design of a CBTE program. Certainly, a leader's commitment to a change program serves as catalyst to others working on it.

Most design personnel also perceived their leaders to be innovators and doers in the design process, by providing necessary and sufficient logistical support for the varied group members. Respondents viewed their leaders as providing adequate feedback about an individual or group's design performance, providing necessary and adequate CBTE and CBTE design information and providing necessary and adequate assistance to all the groups in general and the task group in particular.

Most design personnel also perceived their leader to be supportive of the design process, by providing designers with necessary and sufficient psychological support. Most personnel agreed that their leaders were concerned about their subordinates' CBTE views, spent adequate time with co-workers and supported the different groups' design efforts. Although they were less consistent about the frequency with which they perceived their leaders to be involved in CBTE meetings, this did not seem to be

a major concern since most respondents still believed that their leaders were spending adequate time with them.

Were the task force and policy board chairpersons and the dean or education chairperson of the IHE important to the design of CBTE programs?

The answer to this question must also be yes. The role assumed by these leaders (as seen through a multiple regression analysis) accounted for 32 percent of the variance related to a consortium's receiving four rather than one year program registration. In consortia where leaders were more committed to CBTE and its design, more active in providing CBTE design information and more active in providing adequate and sufficient logistical/psychological support for the design group, IHEs were more likely to receive four rather than one year registrations.

In turn, this was more likely to occur in consortia which worked with small private IHEs rather than with large public IHEs; for, as expected, leaders in small private IHEs were viewed as more committed to CBTE and its design and more psychologically and logistically supportive of others' design efforts.

Are these findings consistent with other theories and studies which have analyzed the change agent role assumed by leaders?

The answer to this question is also yes. Bennis (1966)[4] theorized that the role of the administrator [leader] was to provide consultative and psychological support for the client system during the transactional phase of changes. Davies (1973)[5] believed that agents of change who performed like the agriculture extension agents and combined the roles of consultant, resource provider, trainer and process helper in a change program were more likely to be successful in implementing the change program. And, Jung, Fox and Lippitt (1967)[6], Hage and Aiken (1967)[7] and Brickell (1961)[8] all found that changes were more likely to be implemented if the personnel believed they had their administrator's support.

What do these findings mean for those consortia interested in successfully designing CBTE programs?

The study's findings lead us to conclude that design effort (e.g. receiving a four year rather than one year registration) is related to good leadership practices. Consortia

---

[4]Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 176.

[5]Don Davies, "An Interview with Don Davies," Audio-Visual Instruction, Volume 18 (January 1973), p. 13.

[6]Charles C. Jung, Robert Fox and Ronald Lippitt, "An Orientation and Strategy for Working on Problems of Change in School Systems," Change in School Systems, ed. Goodwin Watson (Washington, D.C.: NTL, 1967), p. 76.

[7]Jerold Hage and Michael Aiken, "Program Change and Organizational Properties, A Comparative Analysis," The American Journal of Sociology, Volume 72, Number 5 (March 1967), p. 507.

[8]Henry A. Brickell, Organizing New York State for Educational Change (Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1961), p. 31.

and IHEs interested in being successful in the CBTE design phase should be concerned with the roles that the varied group leaders assume. Task force, policy board and IHE leaders, particularly those in large, public institutions where many varied interest groups are present, need to be aware of the concerns and needs of those who work to design the programs.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistencey in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium- The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.

2. Policy Board- Group which coordinates and/or directs the activitites of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.

3. Task Force- Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.

4. IHE- This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.

5. Mandate- The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria establised by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.

6. School District- School District involved in the consortium.

7. Professional Agency- This usually refers to the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.

8. Program Proposal- Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.

9. Program Registration- Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE: All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6	Deaf
Speech-Hearing	Blind
Special Education	7-9

APPENDIX B

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Adelphi University
SUNY Albany
Alfred University
SUC Brockport
Dowling College
Fordham University
Ithaca College
Keuka College
Kirkland College
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman
LIU Southampton
Marymount College
Nazareth College
SUC New Paltz
SUC Potsdam
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Vassar College

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

Program Registration	Type of Institution	Number of Responding Institutions
1 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
4 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
1 and 4 year program registration	Public	1
	Private	1

APPENDIX C

	DEAN	TEACHER POLICY BOARD	PRINCIPAL POLICY BOARD	COLLEGE FACULTY POLICY BOARD	CHAIRPERSON POLICY BOARD	TASK CHAIRPERSON	PUBLIC SCHOOL TASK	COLLEGE TASK
1					x		x	
2				x		x		x
3		x	x				x	
4		x	x		x	x	x	x
5			x	x		x		x
6			x	x			x	x
7	x		x		x	x		
8							x	
9				x				
10								
11				x	x	x		
12		x						
13			x	x	x		x	x
14		x	x	x			x	x
15		x	x		x	x	x	x
16								
17			x	x			x	
18		x		x		x		x

Responses per Institution by Role - Leadership

LEADERSHIP

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
1.	The task force leadership approves of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The task force leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The task force leadership spent adequate time with me in helping me design the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I received adequate feedback from the task force leadership in regard to my performance in designing the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The task force leadership supported my efforts in designing the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The task force leadership provided information about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	The task force leadership gave sufficient assistance to the task group who worked on the design of the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The task force leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of assistance in working on the design of the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	The task force leadership seems committed to CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	The task force leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	The task force leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	The task force leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	The task group received adequate feedback from the task force leadership in regard to its performance in designing the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
14.	The task force leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The task force leadership supported the task group's effort in designing the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The task force leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program for our college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The task force leadership provided the task group with the necessary kinds of assistance in working on the design of the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The task force leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program for our college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	The task force leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program for our college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The task force leadership gave sufficient assistance to the Task Group who worked on the design of the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The task force leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	The task force leadership supported the task group's effort in designing the CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5

23. The task force leadership met with the task group:

___ a. once a week
___ b. once every two weeks
___ c. once a month
___ d. several times a year
___ e. never

24. The task force leadership met with me about the design process of CBTE about:

___ a. once a week
___ b. once every two weeks
___ c. once a month
___ d. several times a year
___ e. never

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D (1)

PERCEPTION OF THE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S LEADERSHIP

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. The Dean approves of CBTE	7/43.8	5/31.3	1/6.3	1/6.3	2/12.5
2. The Dean is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	9/56.3	3/18.8	2/12.5	2/12.5	-
3. The Dean spent adequate time with me.	5/31.3	5/31.3	3/18.8	1/6.3	2/12.5
4. I received adequate feedback from the Dean in regard to my CBTE design performance.	7/43.8	4/25.0	1/6.3	2/12.5	2/12.5
5. The Dean supported my CBTE design efforts.	9/56.3	1/6.3	6/37.5	-	-
6. The Dean provided information about CBTE.	7/43.8	2/12.5	3/18.8	2/12.5	2/12.5
7. The Dean gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE task group.	4/25.0	6/37.5	4/25.0	-	2/12.5
8. The Dean provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	4/25.0	4/25.0	6/37.5	-	2/12.5
9. The Dean seems committed to CBTE.	6/37.5	5/31.3	2/12.5	-	3/18.8
10. The Dean provided CBTE design information.	4/25.0	6/37.5	4/25.0	-	2/12.5
11. The Dean spent adequate time with the CBTE task group.	3/18.8	5/31.3	3/18.8	3/18.8	2/12.5
12. The Dean seems indifferent to CBTE.	2/12.5	-	2/12.5	4/25.0	8/50.0
13. The task group received adequate feedback from the Dean in regard to its CBTE design performance.	6/37.5	3/18.8	4/25.0	1/6.3	2/12.5
14. The Dean seems resistant to CBTE.	2/12.5	-	1/6.3	2/12.5	11/68.8
15. The Dean supported the task group's CBTE design effort.	7/43.8	4/25.0	3/18.8	2/12.5	-
16. The Dean seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	8/50.0	2/12.5	2/12.5	1/6.3	3/18.8
17. The Dean provided the task group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	3/18.8	5/31.3	6/37.5	-	2/12.5
18. The Dean seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	2/12.5	1/6.3	1/6.3	3/18.8	9/56.3
19. The Dean seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	2/12.5	1/6.3	1/6.3	1/6.3	11/68.8
20. The Dean gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE design task group.	4/25.0	7/43.8	3/18.8	-	2/12.5
21. The Dean provided information about designing a CBTE program.	4/25.0	5/31.3	3/18.8	2/12.5	2/12.5
22. The Dean supported the task group's design effort.	7/43.8	4/25.0	3/18.8	2/12.5	-

APPENDIX D (1)

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
23. The Dean met with the task group: 1. every meeting 2. every other meeting 3. at most meetings 4. at a few meetings 5. never	2/12.5	-	6/37.5	4/25.0	4/25.0
24. The Dean met with me about the CBTE design process about: 1. every meeting 2. every other meeting 3. at most meetings 4. at a few meetings 5. never	2/12.5	-	5/31.3	6/37.5	3/18.8

TOTAL RESPONSES = 16

Response Key
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX D (2)

PERCEPTION OF THE POLICY BOARD'S LEADERSHIP

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. The policy board leadership approves of CBTE.	12/44.4	9/33.3	4/14.8	2/7.4	-
2. The policy board leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	12/44.4	14/51.9	1/3.7	-	-
3. The policy board leadership spent adequate time with me.	8/29.6	12/44.4	3/11.1	3/11.1	1/3.7
4. I received adequate feedback from the policy board leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	9/33.3	9/33.3	6/22.2	3/11.1	-
5. The policy board leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	10/37.0	8/29.6	6/22.2	3/11.1	-
6. The policy board leadership provided information about CBTE.	11/40.7	11/40.7	3/11.1	2/7.4	-
7. The policy board leadership gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE task group.	11/40.7	11/40.7	2/7.4	3/11.1	-
8. The policy board leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	8/29.6	11/40.7	6/22.2	2/7.4	-
9. The policy board leadership seems committed to CBTE.	13/48.1	8/29.6	4/14.8	1/3.7	1/3.7
10. The policy board leadership provided CBTE design information.	10/37.0	9/33.3	6/22.2	2/7.4	-
11. The policy board leadership spent adequate time with the task group.	10/37.0	10/37.0	5/18.5	2/7.4	-
12. The policy board leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	-	-	4/14.8	2/7.4	21/77.8
13. The task group received adequate feedback from the policy board leadership in regard to its CBTE design performance.	12/44.4	8/29.6	5/18.5	1/3.7	1/3.7
14. The policy board leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	-	-	2/7.4	7/25.9	18/66.7
15. The policy board leadership supported the task group's CBTE design effort.	15/55.6	10/37.0	1/3.7	1/3.7	-
16. The policy board leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	17/63.0	7/25.9	3/11.1	-	-
17. The policy board leadership provided the task group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	10/37.0	11/40.7	4/14.8	2/7.4	-
18. The policy board leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	1/3.7	-	1/3.7	3/11.1	22/81.5
19. The policy board leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	-	-	1/3.7	3/11.1	23/85.2
20. The policy board leadership gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE task group.	10/37.0	11/40.7	4/14.8	1/3.7	1/3.7
21. The policy board leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	9/33.3	13/48.1	4/14.8	1/3.7	-
22. The policy board leadership supported the task group's design effort.	13/48.1	9/33.3	4/14.8	1/3.7	-

APPENDIX D (2) - Continued

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
23. The policy board leadership met with the task group: 1. every meeting 2. every other meeting 3. at most meetings 4. at a few meetings 5. never	14/51.9	-	4/14.8	6/22.2	3/11.1
24. The policy board leadership met with me about the CBTF design process about: 1. every meeting 2. every other meeting 3. at most meetings 4. at a few meetings 5. never	12/44.4	1/3.7	5/18.5	8/29.6	1/3.7

TOTAL RESPONDENTS = 27

Response Key
1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

APPENDIX D (3)

PERCEPTION OF THE TASK FORCE'S LEADERSHIP

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. The task force leadership approves of CBTE.	6/33.3	7/38.9	5/27.8	-	-
2. The task force leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	8/44.4	8/44.4	2/11.1	-	-
3. The task force leadership spent adequate time with me.	6/33.3	7/38.9	3/16.7	2/11.1	-
4. I received adequate feedback from the task force leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	7/38.9	8/44.4	2/11.1	1/5.6	-
5. The task force leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	10/55.6	7/38.9	1/5.6	-	-
6. The task force leadership provided information about CBTE.	9/50.0	7/38.9	1/5.6	1/5.6	-
7. The task force leadership gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE task group.	4/22.2	9/50.0	4/22.2	1/5.6	-
8. The task force leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	4/22.2	10/55.6	4/22.2	-	-
9. The task force leadership seems committed to CBTE.	4/22.2	11/61.1	3/16.7	-	-
10. The task force leadership provided CBTE design information.	5/27.8	11/61.1	1/5.6	1/5.6	-
11. The task force leadership spent adequate time with the CBTE task group.	5/27.8	7/38.9	5/27.8	1/5.6	-
12. The task force leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	-	2/11.1	2/11.1	4/22.2	10/55.6
13. The task group received adequate feedback from the task group leadership in regard to its CBTE design performance.	6/33.3	8/44.4	3/16.7	1/5.6	-
14. The task force leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	-	1/5.6	2/11.1	3/16.7	12/66.7
15. The task force leadership supported the task group's CBTE design effort.	7/38.9	9/50.0	2/11.1	-	-
16. The task force leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	8/44.4	9/50.0	1/5.6	-	-
17. The task force leadership provided the task group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	4/22.2	10/55.6	3/16.7	1/5.6	-
18. The task force leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	-	1/5.6	1/5.6	5/27.8	11/61.1
19. The task force leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	-	1/5.6	1/5.6	5/27.8	11/61.1
20. The task force leadership gave sufficient assistance to the CBTE design task group.	4/22.2	10/55.6	4/22.2	-	-

APPENDIX D (3) - Continued

Leadership Category	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
21. The task force leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	6/33.3	9/50.0	2/11.1	1/5.6	-
22. The task force leadership supported the task group's design effort.	6/33.3	12/66.7	-	-	-
23. The task force leadership met with the task group: 1. once a week 2. once every two weeks 3. once a month 4. several times a year 5. never	2/11.1	1/5.6	7/38.9	7/38.9	1/5.6
24. The task force leadership met with me about the CBTE design process about: 1. once a week 2. once every two weeks 3. once a month 4. several times a year 5. never	2/11.1	1/5.6	8/44.4	5/27.8	2/11.1

TOTAL RESPONDENTS = 18

Response Key:

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX D (4)

Perception of All Groups' Leadership

LEADERSHIP CATEGORY	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Our group's leadership approves of CBTE.	25/41.0	21/34.4	10/16.4	3/4.9	2/3.3
2. Our group's leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	29/47.5	25/41.0	5/8.2	2/3.3	---
3. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with me.	19/31.0	24/39.3	9/14.8	6/9.8	3/4.9
4. I received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	23/37.7	21/34.4	9/14.8	6/9.8	2/3.3
5. Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	29/47.5	16/26.2	13/21.3	3/4.9	---
6. Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE.	27/44.3	20/32.8	7/11.5	5/8.2	2/3.3
7. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	19/31.1	26/42.6	10/16.4	4/6.6	2/3.3
8. Our group's leadership provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	16/26.2	25/41.0	16/26.2	2/3.3	2/3.3
9. Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.	23/37.7	24/39.3	9/14.8	1/1.6	4/6.6
10. Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information.	19/31.1	26/42.6	11/18.0	3/4.9	2/3.3
11. Our group's leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	18/29.5	22/36.1	13/21.13	6/9.8	2/3.3
12. Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	2/3.3	2/3.3	8/13.1	10/16.4	39/63.9
13. Our group received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to it CBTE design performance.	24/39.3	19/31.1	12/19.7	3/4.9	3/4.9
14. Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	2/3.3	1/1.6	5/8.2	12/19.7	41/67.2
15. Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.	29/47.5	23/37.7	6/9.8	3/4.9	---
16. Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	33/54.1	18/29.5	6/9.8	1/1.6	3/4.9
17. Our group's leadership provided our group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	17/27.9	26/42.6	13/21.3	3/4.9	2/3.3
18. Our group's leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program	3/4.9	2/3.3	3/4.9	11/18.0	42/68.9
19. Our group's leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	2/3.3	2/3.3	3/4.9	9/14.8	45/73.8

20. Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	18/29.5	28/45.9	11/18.0	1/1.6	3/4.9
21. Our group's leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	19/31.1	27/44.3	9/14.8	4/6.6	2/3.3
22. Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort.	26/42.6	25/41.0	7/11.5	3/4.9	---
23. Our group's leadership met with our group: a. once a week b. once every two weeks, c. once a month d. several times a year, e. never	18/29.5	1/1.6	17/27.9	17/27.9	8/13.1
24. Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process alour: a. once a week, b. once every two weeks, c. once a month, d. several times a year, e. never.	16/26.2	2/3.3	18/29.5	19/31.1	6/9.8
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	61				

Response Key: 1 = once a week
2 = once every two weeks
3 = once a month
4 = several times a year
5 = never

The group's leadership related to task group, policy board, or IHE. The dean was leader of IHE; others were elicited from the task or policy board group.

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

One Way Analysis of Variance Tables for Leadership Variables

1. Leadership Variable: Our group leaderships seems committed to CBTE.

   Grouping: Public or Private IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	5.4345	1	5.4345	4.817	.030
Within Groups	66.5655	59	1.1282		
TOTAL	72.00	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Public	2.6363
2. Private	1.8600

2. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.

   Grouping: Public or Private IHE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.7251	1	6.7251	6.720	.012
Within Groups	59.0455	59	1.0008		
TOTAL	65.7705	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Public	3.6363
2. Private	4.5000

3. Leadership Variable: Our group received adequate feedback from our leadership.

Grouping: Public or Private IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.6270	1	4.6270	3.887	.051
Within Groups	70.2255	59	1.1903		
TOTAL	74.8525	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Public	2.6363
2. Private	1.9200

4. Leadership Variable: Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.

Grouping: Public or Private IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2.8459	1	2.8459	4.260	.041
Within Groups	39.4164	59	.6681		
TOTAL		60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Public	2.1818
2. Private	1.6200

5. Leadership Variable: Our group leadership approves of CBTE.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.5475	1	6.5475	6.626	.012
Within Groups	58.3049	59	.9882		
TOTAL	64.8525	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Large	2.1628
2. Small	1.4444

6. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.4537	1	6.4537	8.294	.006
Within Groups	45.9070	59	.7781		
TOTAL	52.3607	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Large	2.0465
2. Small	1.3333

7. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	7.8811	1	7.8811	7.252	.009
Within Groups	64.1189	59	1.0868		
TOTAL		60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Large	2.2326
2. Small	1.4444

8. Leadership Variable: Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE.

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.5778	1	3.5778	4.093	.045
Within Groups	51.5698	59	.8741		
TOTAL		60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Large	4.3023
2. Small	4.8333

9. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.8437	1	3.8437	5.903	.017
Within Groups	38.4186	59	.6512		
TOTAL	42.2623	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Large	2.1628
2. Small	1.4444

10. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.

Grouping: IHE or Policy Board or Task Force Group

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	7.3473	2	3.6736	3.645	.032
Within Groups	58.4560	58	1.0079		
TOTAL	65.8033	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1.Task Force	1.6111
2.IHE	2.3125
3.Policy Board	1.4815

11. Leadership Variable: Our group's leadership met with our group:

1 - once a week (every meeting)
2 - one every two weeks (every other meeting)
3 - once a month (most of the time)
4 - several times a year (at a few meetings)
5 - never

Grouping: IHE or Policy Board or Task Force Group

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	14.1081	2	7.0540	3.801	.028
Within Groups	107.6296	58	1.8557		
TOTAL	121.7377	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Task Force	3.2222
2. IHE	3.5000
3. Policy Board	2.4074

12. Leadership Variable: One group's leadership met with one about the CPTE design process:

1 - once a week (every meeting)
2 - once every two weeks (every other meeting)
3 - once a month (at most meetings)
4 - several times a year (at a few meetings)
5 - never

ANOVA TABLE

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	13.0747	2	6.5373	3.959	.024
Within Groups	95.7778	58	1.6513		
TOTAL	108.8525	60			

Group	$\bar{X}$
1. Task Force	3.2222
2. IHE	3.5000
3. Policy Board	2.4444

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

Factor Analysis of Leadership Variables -- Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

	VARIABLE LIST	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1.	Our group's leadership approves of CBTE.	.08007	.77200*	.31466	.15479	.16435
2.	Our group's leadership is concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	.17970	.38264	.63026*	.08939	-.03027
3.	Our group's leadership spent adequate time with me.	.52882	.49407	.23292	.08514	.40323
4.	I received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to my CBTE design performance.	.56641	.12998	.24500	.31804	.47906
5.	Our group's leadership supported my CBTE design efforts.	.26091	.22721	.27488	.06758	.78720*
6.	Our group's leadership provided information about CBTE.	.76806*	.12745	.13339	.20929	.31934
7.	Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.77048*	.07128	.25113	.31693	.19677
8.	Our group's leadership provided me with the necersary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.80665*	.09610	.05258	.17566	.41909
9.	Our group's leadership seems committed to CBTE.	.18015	.76533*	.37594	.04755	.22565
10.	Our group's leadership provided CBTE design information.	.82916*	.32243	-.05547	.08620	.03137
11.	Our group's leadership spent adequate time with the task group in helping them design the CBTE program.	.74843*	.16119	.35588	.27495	-.04506
12.	Our group's leadership seems indifferent to CBTE.	.58079	.37919	.28631	.29957	-.10690
13.	Our group received adequate feedback from our group's leadership in regard to it CBTE design performance.	.71675*	.15587	.45060	.08896	.15956
14.	Our group leadership seems resistant to CBTE.	.16789	.84030*	.14005	.06685	.06549
15.	Our group leadership supported our group's CBTE design effort.	.26304	.29663	.79292*	-.00704	.24494
16.	Our group's leadership seemed committed to designing a CBTE program.	.42248	.71580*	.05928	.10553	.06184
17.	Our group's leadership provided our group with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	.87210*	.19136	.23618	.05590	.11511
18.	Our group's leadership seemed indifferent to designing a CBTE program.	.63004*	.36648	.17897	.36495	-.22729
19.	Our group's leadership seemed resistant to designing a CBTE program.	.10696	.85358	.15270	.24609	.05601
20.	Our group's leadership gave sufficient assistance to our group.	.87583*	.07221	.27490	.06066	.19376

21. Our group's leadership provided information about designing a CBTE program.	.85108*	.24328	.02867	.09406	.15733
22. Our group's leadership supported our group's design effort.	.34010	.24025	.65191*	.13590	.47739
23. Our group's leadership met with our group: a. once a week b. once every two weeks, c. once a month d. several times a year, e. never	.22945	.18668	.04260	.85895*	-.02764
24. Our group's leadership met with me about the CBTE design process abour: a. once a week, b. once every two weeks, c. once a month, d. several times a year, e. never.	.28290	.20332	.06142	.79078*	.30528

TOTAL RESPONDENTS = 61

*Correlation Coefficient (r) ≥.60000

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

The group's leadership related to task group, policy board, or IHE. The dean was leader of IHE; others were elicited from the task or policy board group.